RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 2 1 2006 **OFFICIAL**

CARDINAL LAW GROUP

1603 Orrington Avenue/Suite 2000
Evanston, Illinois 60201
Telephone 847 – 905 - 7111
Facsimile 847 – 905 – 7113

Date:	FEBRUARY 21, 2006
To:	EXAMINER NGUYEN, THANH
	U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
Fax #:	(571) 273-8300
From:	FRANK C. NICHOLAS
Phone #:	(847) 424-2521
Client/Matter No.:	AUS920000812US1 (9000/12)
# of Pages:	22

(including cover sheet)

IF YOU HAVE ANY PROBLEMS RECEIVING THIS MESSAGE, PLEASE CALL 847/905-7111, Ext. 112 AND ASK FOR JENNIFER CRUZ

PTO/SB/21 (12-97). Approved for use through 8/30/00. OMB 0651-0031. Patent and Trademark Office. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number

TRANSMITTAL FORM	Attorney Docket No	AUS920000812US1 (9000/12)
	Application Number	09/731,629
	Filing Date	DECEMBER 7, 2000
	First Named Inventor	STEVEN M. FRENCH
(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Group Art Unit	2144
	Examiner	NGUYEN, THANH T.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
FEB 21 2006

ENCLOSURES *(check all that apply)*

☐ Amendment

   ☐ After Final

   ☐ Affidavits/declaration(s)

☐ Status Letter

☐ One-Month Petition for Extension of Time Request (dup)

☐ Express Abandonment Request

☐ Information Disclosure Statement, PTO-1449

☐ Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)

☐ Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application

☐ Assignment Papers

☐ Drawing Sheets

☐ After Allowance Communication to Group

☐ Petition Routing Slip (PTO/SB/69) and Accompanying Petition

☐ To Convert a Provisional Application

☐ Change of Correspondence Address

☐ Terminal Disclaimer

☐ Small Entity Statement

☐ Request of Refund

☐ Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences

☒ Appeal Brief

☐ Proprietary Information

☐ Post Card Receipt

☐ Additional Enclosure(s) *(please identify below)*

☐

☐

☐

☒ The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No 07-0960 (GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION). A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

☒ I hereby petition under 37 CFR § 1.136(a) for any extension of time required to ensure that this paper is timely filed. Please charge any associated fees which have not otherwise been paid to Deposit Account No. 07-0960 (GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION). A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

CALCULATION OF FEE

	Claims After Amendment		Highest No Previously Paid For	Present Extra	Small Entity		or	Large Entity	
					Rate	Add'l Fee		Rate	Add'l Fee
Total		Minus		0	x $25=	0		x $50=	
Indep		Minus		0	x $100=	0		x $200=	
First Presentation of Multiple Dep. Claim					+$180=	—		+ $380=	
					total add'l fee	$ 0		total add'l fee	$ 0

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

| Firm or Individual name | FRANK C. NICHOLAS Registration No 33,983 CARDINAL LAW GROUP 1603 Orrington Avenue, Suite 2000 Evanston, IL 60201 | | |
| Signature | *[signature]* | Date | February 21, 2006 |

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to (571) 273-8300 to: the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on this date:

| | | | February 21, 2006 |
| Signature | *[signature]* FRANK C. NICHOLAS (33,983) | Date | February 21, 2006 |

PTO/SB/21 (12-07) Approved for use through 0/50/00. OMB 0651-0031 Patent and Trademark Office U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paper Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

|	
Attorney Docket No.	AUS920000912US1 (9000/12)
Application Number	09/731,629
Filing Date	DECEMBER 7, 2000
First Named Inventor	STEVEN M. FRENCH
Group Art Unit	2144
Examiner	NGUYEN, THANH T.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
FEB 21 2006

ENCLOSURES *(check all that apply)*

☐	Amendment	☐	Assignment Papers	☐	Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
	☐ After Final	☐	Drawing Sheets	☒	Appeal Brief
	☐ Affidavits/declaration(s)	☐	After Allowance Communication to Group		
		☐	Petition Routing Slip (PTO/SB/69) and Accompanying Petition	☐	Proprietary Information
☐	Status Letter	☐	To Convert a Provisional Application	☐	Post Card Receipt
☐	One-Month Petition for Extension of Time Request (aup)	☐	Change of Correspondence Address	☐	Additional Enclosure(s) (please identify below)
☐	Express Abandonment Request	☐	Terminal Disclaimer	☐	
☐	Information Disclosure Statement, PTO-1449	☐	Small Entity Statement	☐	
☐	Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	☐	Request of Refund	☐	
☐	Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application	☒	The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 07-0960 (GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION). A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed		
		☒	I hereby petition under 37 CFR § 1.136(a) for any extension of time required to ensure that this paper is timely filed. Please charge any associated fees which have not otherwise been paid to Deposit Account No. 07-0960 (GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION). A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.		

CALCULATION OF FEE

	Claims After Amendment		Highest No. Previously Paid For	Present Extra	Small Entity		or	Large Entity	
					Rate	Add'l Fee		Rate	Add'l Fee
Total		Minus		0	x $25=	0		x $50=	
Indep.		Minus		0	x $100=	0		x $200=	
First Presentation of Multiple Dep. Claim					+$180=	—		+$360=	
					total add'l fee	$ 0		total add'l fee	$ 0

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm or individual name	FRANK C. NICHOLAS Registration No. 33,983 CARDINAL LAW GROUP 1603 Orrington Avenue, Suite 2000 Evanston, IL 60201		
Signature	*[signature]*	Date	February 21, 2006

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to (571) 273-8300 to: the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on this date.			February 21, 2006
Signature	*[signature]* FRANK C. NICHOLAS (33,983)	Date:	February 21, 2006

PATENT
Case No.: AUS920000812US1
(9000/12)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re patent application of:	)	
	)	
STEVEN M. FRENCH, ET AL.	)	Examiner: NGUYEN, THANH
	)	
Serial No.: 09/731,629	)	
	)	Group Art Unit: 2144
Filed: DECEMBER 7, 2000	)	
Title: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR	)	Conf. No.: 1076
AUTOMATICALLY ASSOCIATING AN	)	
ADDRESS WITH A TARGET DEVICE	)	

APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Briefs - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Appellants herewith respectfully present their appeal brief as follows:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

February 21, 2006
Case No.: AUS920000812US1 (9000/12)
Serial No.: 09/731,629
Filed: December 7, 2000
Page 3 of 19

1. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest remains Assignee INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION, by virtue of an assignment executed by the inventors on December 5, 2000 and filed with the United States Patent and Trademark Office on December 7, 2000, recorded at reel number 011372 frame number 0014.

February 21, 2006
Case No.: AUS920000812US1 (9000/12)
Serial No.: 09/731,629
Filed: December 7, 2000
Page 4 of 19

2.   RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellants and the undersigned attorneys are not aware of any appeals or any interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or having a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

3.   STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-9 and 11-27 stand rejected as unpatentable over Beelitz, et. al., United States Patent No. 6,182,275B1 in view of Cohn et. al, United States Patent 6,411,684.

Claims 1-9 and 11-27 are the claims on appeal. *See*, Appendix.

February 21, 2006
Case No.: AUS920000812US1 (9000/12)
Serial No.: 09/731,629
Filed: December 7, 2000
Page 6 of 19

4.   STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

All amendments have been entered.

5.   SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

In this summary of claimed subject matter, all citations are to the specification of United States Patent Application 09/731,629 filed on December 7, 2000. Further, all citations are illustrative only and support for the cited element may be found elsewhere in the specification.

The invention relates to a method of generating a list of target devices to be configured in communication with a server. The method includes creating a first list of target devices to be configured 504 and identifying at least one addressed target device 408, 410, 412 having an associated network address. The method further includes modifying the first list of target devices using the addressed target device 510, and generating a modified list of target devices to be configured 544, wherein the target devices are to be remotely booted by the server 404 and wherein the target devices 408, 410, 412 are persistently and concurrently in communication with the server 404 by means of a network 402. *See,* FIGS 4 and 5, and pages 10-14 of the specification, *inter alia.*

6.   GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 1-9 and 11-27 were rejected as unpatentable over Beelitz, et. al., United

States Patent No. 6,182,275B1 in view of Cohn et. al, United States Patent 6,411,684.

7. ARGUMENTS

A. The Examiner rejected claims 1-9 and 11-27 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by Beelitz in view of Cohn

The §103(a) rejection of claims 1-9 and 11-27 has been traversed. In order to maintain this §103(a) rejection, each and every element of the claimed invention must be taught or suggested by the references alone or in combination. Because the references do not teach or suggest each and every element, this rejection must fall.

Claims 1, 13, and 23 require, *inter alia,* "the target devices are persistently and concurrently in communication with the server by means of a network." The Examiner correctly notes that Beelitz does not teach or suggest such an element, and instead cites to Cohn for such teachings. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that it "would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Cohn into the computer system of Beelitz to have persistent and concurrent in communication with the server by means of a network because it would have been provided specific functions that can operating or occurring at the same time and continuing without change in function or structure in the network." [sic] See, ¶5 of the September 20, 2005 office action.

The Appellants traverse the Examiner's assertion because Beelitz specifically teaches away from such a combination, there must be a reasonable expectation of success, and the mere ability to combine references is insufficient to support a rejection.

Beelitz teaches away from the combination

Beelitz teaches a generation of a compatible order for a computer system. The Beelitz system is for specifying, ordering, and building a build-to-order computer system, such that a purchaser of a build-to-order computer system can buy and order such a computer over a computer network such as the Internet. See, abstract, Beelitz.

Beelitz, teaches "[I]n step 207, control 103 *provides to the user interface 105* a list of the operating system types available." (emphasis added) at column 7 55-56. Furthermore,"[I]n step 204, *control 103 accesses the master data base 125* to create or generate a list of operating system types available for the targeted computer system" (column 7 lines 35-37).

Control 103 "receives an indication *from a user interface* 105 indicating the desire to purchase a computer system." Column 7, lines 30-32 (emphasis added). Thus, control 103 is distinguished from the targeted computer system 137 (FIG. 1 of Beelitz) and the terminal or user interface 105 (FIG. 1 of Beelitz).

Beelitz teaches that it has been known to install software programs and to perform tests on computer systems *before they are shipped* to businesses or individual customers. The goal of software installation and testing, according to Beelitz, is to efficiently produce a useful, reliable, computer system which may be *delivered* to businesses and individuals free from errors and ready to run. Beelitz, column 1, lines 56-61.

One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that shipping a computer to a business or individual customer requires *disconnecting* any network connections used for software installation and testing. Those of ordinary skill in the art would also recognize that disconnecting a network connection terminates the connection, and therefore disconnecting a network connection is inconsistent with a persistent and concurrent network connection. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art could not possibly be motivated to make the modifications suggested by the Examiner, as Beelitz unequivocally teaches away from the combination.

At most, Beelitz discloses that a targeted computer system 137 is initially booted up to perform the operations and instructions as per associated shell script files to load the selected programs onto its hard drive and to run the tests. In one embodiment, the selected software programs and operating systems can be down loaded and installed on the targeted computer system via the Internet. *See*, column 15, lines 1-7. Thus, Beelitz does not disclose "the target devices are persistently and concurrently in communication with the server by means of a network." Beelitz teaches only loading and installing the operating system onto the targeted computer system, prior to disconnecting the network connection to enable the newly built-to-order computer to ship to a business or individual.

There is no reasonable expectation of success

Similarly, there is no reasonable expectation of success based on the combination of references. MPEP 2143.02, In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Here, modifying the Beelitz system to feature "target devices [that] are persistently and concurrently in communication with the server by means of a network" would entirely defeat the purpose of Beelitz, and cannot lead to any reasonable expectation of success. Indeed, one of ordinary skill in the art would more likely find a reasonable expectation of *failure*.

The Examiner asserts that it "would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Cohn into the computer system of Beelitz to have persistent and concurrent in communication with the server by means of a network because it would have been provided specific functions that can operating or occurring at the same time and continuing without change in function or structure in the network." [sic] However, any such modification would in fact change the function or structure of the network, contrary to the Examiner's assertions. The function and structure of the Beelitz network is to efficiently produce a useful, reliable, computer system which may be *delivered* to businesses and individuals free from errors and ready to run. Beelitz, column 1, lines 56-61. Modifying the function or structure of the Beelitz network would not result in the claimed invention, but would rather result in a business or individual purchasing a built-to-order computer that is not

delivered to the purchasing business or individual, but rather a computer that remains at the factory, sitting on an assembly line.

The mere ability to combine references is insufficient to support a rejection

The mere fact that Beelitz can be modified in view of Cohn to obtain the claimed invention (which Appellants deny) does not render the resultant modification obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. See, *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (Claims were directed to an apparatus for producing an aerated cementitious composition by drawing air into the cementitious composition by driving the output pump at a capacity greater than the feed rate. The prior art reference taught that the feed means can be run at a variable speed, however the court found that this does not require that the output pump be run at the claimed speed so that air is drawn into the mixing chamber and is entrained in the ingredients during operation. Although a prior art device "may be capable of being modified to run the way the apparatus is claimed, there must be a suggestion or motivation in the reference to do so." 916 F.2d at 682, 16 USPQ2d at 1432.). See also *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 23 USPQ2d 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1992) (flexible landscape edging device which is conformable to a ground surface of varying slope not suggested by combination of prior art references).

The basis for the Examiner's assertion is that "it would have been provided specific functions that can operating or occurring at the same time and continuing without change in function or structure in the network." (pg. 3, Sept. 20, 2005 office action). However, the Examiner simply cannot conclusively assert that an implementation of the allegedly persistent and concurrent communication with the server by means of a network taught by Cohn would permit the ability to efficiently produce a useful, reliable, computer system which may be *delivered* to businesses and individuals free from errors and ready to run. *See*, Beelitz, column 1, lines 56-61. Indeed, implementing a persistent and concurrent communication with a server, as allegedly taught by Cohn, would simply not work in a Beelitz system and would destroy the principle of operation of Beelitz.

Therefore, Appellants request the withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1, 13, and 23, as well as claims 2-9, 11-12, 14-22 and 24-27 depending directly or indirectly from one of claims 1, 13, or 23.

February 21, 2006
Case No.: AUS920000812US1 (9000/12)
Serial No.: 09/731,629
Filed: December 7, 2000
Page 13 of 19

SUMMARY

The Appellants respectfully request maintenance of their appeal, and submit that claims 1-9 and 11-27 fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested.

Dated: **February 21, 2006**

Respectfully submitted,
STEVEN M. FRENCH, et al.

FRANK C. NICHOLAS,
Registration No. (33,983)
Attorney for Appellants

CARDINAL LAW GROUP
1603 Orrington Avenue, Suite 2000
Evanston, IL 60201
(847) 905-7111

10. APPENDIX

1.   A method of generating a list of target devices to be configured in communication with a server comprising:

        creating a first list of target devices to be configured;

        identifying at least one addressed target device having an associated network address;

        modifying the first list of target devices using the addressed target device; and

        generating a modified list of target devices to be configured, wherein the target devices are to be remotely booted by the server and wherein the target devices are persistently and concurrently in communication with the server by means of a network.

2.   (Original) The method of claim 1 wherein the addressed target device is listed in at least one information source.

3.   The method of claim 1 further comprising:

        adding the associated network address of the addressed target device to the first list of target devices.

4.   The method of claim 1 further comprising:

        adding the addressed target device having an associated network address to the first list of target devices.

5.   The method of claim 1 further comprising:

        removing the addressed target device having an associated network address from the first list of target devices.

6. The method of claim 1 further comprising:

pre-configuring at least one preconfigured target device.

7. The method of claim 6 further comprising:

adding the preconfigured target device to the first list.

8. The method of claim 1 further comprising:

determining if a target device has an associated network address; and

removing the target device from the modified list of target devices if it

does not have an associated network address.

9. The method of claim 1 further comprising:

providing the modified list to the server.

11. The method of claim 1 further comprising:

examining packet data to determine if a target device has an associated

network address.

12. The method of claim 1 further comprising:

examining log data to determine if a target device has an associated net-

work address.

13.   Computer program product in a computer usable medium for generating a list of target devices to be configured in communication with a server comprising:

means for creating a first list of target devices to be configured;

means for identifying with an identification at least one addressed target device having an associated network address;

means for modifying the first list of target devices using the addressed target device; and

means for generating a modified list of target devices to be configured, wherein the target devices are to be remotely booted by the server and wherein the target devices are persistently and concurrently in communication with the server by means of a network.

14.   The program of claim 13 further comprising:

means for storing the identification of the addressed target device.

15.   The program of claim 13 further comprising:

means for adding the associated network address of the addressed target device to the first list of target devices.

16.   The program of claim 13 further comprising:

means for adding the addressed target device having an associated network address to the first list of target devices.

17.   The program of claim 13 further comprising:

means for removing the addressed target device having an associated network address from the first list of target devices.

18.   The program of claim 13 further comprising:

        means for preconfiguring at least one target device listed in the first list.

19.   The program of claim 13 further comprising:

        means for removing a target device without an associated network address from the modified list of target devices.

20.   The program of claim 13 further comprising:

        means for configuring the target devices listed in the modified list.

21.   The program of claim 13 further comprising:

        means for examining packet data to determine if a target device has an associated network address.

22.   The program of claim 13 further comprising:

        means for examining log data to determine if a target device has an associated network address.

·

February 21, 2006
Case No.: AUS920000812US1 (9000/12)
Serial No.: 09/731,629
Filed: December 7, 2000
Page 18 of 19

23.   A data processing system, the system including target devices and a server comprising:

means for creating a first list of target devices to be configured, wherein the target devices are to be remotely booted by the server;

means for identifying at least one addressed target device having an associated network address;

means for comparing the addressed target device to the target devices on the first list; and

means for generating a modified list of target devices to be configured based on the addressed target device and wherein the target devices are persistently and concurrently in communication with the server by means of a network.

24.   The system of claim 23, further comprising:
means for storing information about the addressed target device.

25.   The system of claim 23 further comprising:
means for configuring at least one target device.

26.   The system of claim 23 further comprising:
means for determining if a target device has an associated network address.

27.   The method of claim 1 further comprising:
creating a router list of target devices;
comparing the router list and the first list of target devices, and wherein modifying the first list of target devices using the addressed target device comprises modifying the first list of target devices based on the comparison

February 21, 2006
Case No.: AUS920000812US1 (9000/12)
Serial No.: 09/731,629
Filed: December 7, 2000
Page 19 of 19

Evidence Appendix

None

Related Proceedings Appendix

None.